arXiv:1610.05058v1 [cs.SY] 17 Oct 2016

Goodwin's oscillators with an additional negative feedback for modeling hormonal regulation systems ⋆

Hadi Taghvafard [a], Anton V. Proskurnikov [b,c,d], Ming Cao [a]

[a] *Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands*

[b] *Delft Center for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands*

[c] *Institute for Problems of Mechanical Engineering RAS, St. Petersburg, Russia*

[d] *ITMO University, St. Petersburg, Russia*

Abstract

To understand the sophisticated control mechanisms of the human's endocrine system is a challenging task that is a crucial step towards precise medical treatment of many disfunctions and diseases. Although mathematical models describing the endocrine system as a whole are still elusive, recently some substantial progress has been made in analyzing theoretically its subsystems (or *axes*) that regulate production of specific hormones. Many of the relevant mathematical models are similar in structure to (or squarely based on) the celebrated *Goodwin's oscillator*. Such models are convenient to explain stable periodic oscillations at hormones' level by representing the corresponding endocrine regulation circuits as *cyclic* feedback systems. However, many real hormonal regulation mechanisms (in particular, testosterone regulation) are in fact known to have non-cyclic structures and involve multiple feedbacks; a Goodwin-type model thus represents only a part of such a complicated mechanism. In this paper, we examine a new mathematical model of hormonal regulation, obtained from the classical Goodwin's oscillator by introducing an additional negative feedback. Local stability properties of the proposed model are studied, and we show that the local instability of its unique equilibrium implies oscillatory behavior of almost all solutions. Furthermore, under additional restrictions we prove that almost all solutions converge to periodic ones.

Key words: Biomedical systems; Stability; Periodic solutions; Oscillations.

1 Introduction

Hormones are signaling molecules that are secreted by glands and involved in many vital bodily functions, such as growth, reproduction and metabolism. This motivates to study complex mechanisms of interactions between glands and hormones, coupling them into the *endocrine system*. To obtain a "global" biomathematical model, describing the endocrine system in whole, is a challenging problem. However, some visible progress has been made in modeling its subsystems, or *axes*, controlling the secretion of specific hormones. Such models have been studied in the literature since 1950s [41].

It has been revealed [30] that many "neurohormone" regulatory circuits, controlled by the brain regulatory centers, are based on a feedback mechanism that is very similar to the genetic oscillators, described by Goodwin [19]. One of the most studied hormonal axis is the Hypothalamic-Pituitary-Gonadal axis, regulating the reproductive functions, which is related also to the processes of aging [36, 52]. In males this axis is constituted by the Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone (GnRH), the Luteinizing Hormone (LH) and Testosterone (Te). GnRH influences the secretion of LH, which stimulates the secretion of Te, which in turn represses the secretion of GnRH and LH, closing thus a feedback loop.

The feedback mechanism of the GnRH-LH-Te axis serves as a "benchmark" in mathematical modeling of hormonal regulation and has been extensively studied in the literature. Smith [45] suggested that the concentrations

⋆ This work was supported in part by the STW (projects vidi-438730 and 13712) and European Research Council (ERC-StG-307207). The results have been partly reported at the IFAC Workshop on Periodic Control Systems PSYCO'16, Eindhoven, The Netherlands [48]. Corresponding author H. Taghvafard

Email addresses: taghvafard@gmail.com (Hadi Taghvafard), anton.p.1982@ieee.org (Anton V. Proskurnikov), m.cao@rug.nl (Ming Cao).

of the three hormones obey the usual Goodwin oscillator model from [19]. A well-known restriction of this model is the narrow class of nonlinear feedback maps, which guarantees the instability of the equilibrium and existence of periodic orbits; describing the feedback by the conventional Hill function [17], the Hill constant should be greater than 8 [21,37,45]. This restriction can be substantially relaxed (yet not completely discarded [15]), taking into account the inevitable delays, caused by hormone transporting between the testicles and the control centers in the brain [12, 37, 42, 46]. Another approach to hormonal regulation modeling replaces the continuous Hill-type nonlinear map in Goodwin's model by the discontinuous Heaviside function [6, 11] or more general pulse modulators [8, 29], capturing the effect of periodic pulses in the GnRH secretion [29]. Some models combine the delays and discontinuities [6, 7]. In order to take unmodeled dynamics and uncertain noises into account, stochastic Goodwin-type models of hormonal regulation systems have recently been suggested [29, 30].

Whereas the mathematical models for hormonal regulation [30] may substantially differ, most of them assume the presence of a single negative feedback. At the same time, strong experimental evidence exists that the feedback mechanisms of "neurohormone" regulation circuits are more complicated and involve several feedbacks. In the testosterone regulation mechanisms two inhibitory feedbacks (from Te to GnRH and LH) have been reported [3, 5, 38, 52]; a similar two-feedback circuit controls the hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal axis [4, 22, 24].

Up to now, only a few hormonal regulation models with multiple feedback loops have been addressed in the literature [4, 5, 20, 49]. These models are much more complicated for rigorous analysis than the conventional Goodwin's oscillator [19, 45], being uncovered by the existing theory for cyclic feedback systems (see e.g. [25, 26]). The existing works are mainly confined to numerical analysis [5] or establishing local stability properties and Hopf bifurcation analysis [4, 20, 49]. In this paper, we examine a new model of a hormonal regulation circuit, which is derived from the classical Goodwin's oscillator yet has an additional negative feedback. Unlike the paper [4], dealing with a similar model, the two feedback loops may be described by different nonlinearities, which are not restricted to be Hill functions. Unlike the previous papers [4, 5, 20, 49], we establish not only "local" but also some "global" properties of the proposed model such as the oscillatory behavior of almost all its solutions. It should be noticed that the potential applications of the introduced model are not limited to hormonal regulation; similar models with multiple feedback loops have been reported to describe the dynamics of some metabolic pathways [16, 35, 44].

To keep the analysis concise, in this paper we neglect the transport delays, discontinuities and stochastic noises. More general models of hormonal regulation with several negative feedback loops, taking the aforementioned effects into account, are subjects of ongoing research.



Fig. 1. The structural scheme of the Goodwin-Smith oscillator model (1): two positive and one negative influence

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the Goodwin-Smith model and its two-feedback extension. In Section 3, the local stability properties of the new model are discussed. The "global" results, ensuring the existence of oscillations in the proposed model are presented in Section 4. The results of the paper are proved in Section 5. Section 6 illustrates the proposed model by numerical simulations. Section 7 concludes the paper.

2 The Goodwin-Smith model and its extension

The conventional Goodwin-Smith model [19, 45] describes a self-regulating system of three chemicals, whose concentrations are denoted, following [45], by R, L and T and evolve in accordance with the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{R} &= -b_1 R + f(T), \\ \dot{L} &= g_1 R - b_2 L, \\ \dot{T} &= g_2 L - b_3 T. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The constants $b_i > 0$ (where $i = 1, 2, 3$) stand for the clearing rates of the corresponding chemicals, whereas the constants $g_1, g_2 > 0$ and the decreasing function $f : [0; \infty) \to (0; \infty)$ determine their production rates. Typically $f(T)$ stands for the nonlinear *Hill function*

$$f(T) = \frac{K}{1 + \beta T^n} \tag{2}$$

where $K, \beta, n > 0$ are constants. A chemical interpretation of the Hill function is discussed in [17, 37]. The dynamics (1) imply that the first chemical accelerates (activates) the production of the second one: the growth of the concentration R results in the increase of the production rate $\dot{L}$. Similarly, the second chemical activates the production of the third one. However, the third chemical represses (inhibits) the production of the first one, closing thus the negative *feedback loop* (Fig. 1): an increase in T reduces the production rate $\dot{R}$.

The model (1) was originally used by B.C. Goodwin for modeling oscillations in a single self-repressing gene [19, 37]; in the Goodwin's model R, L and T stand, respectively, for the concentrations of the messenger RNA, the protein encoded by the gene and an intermediate enzyme, which represses the gene's transcription.



Fig. 2. The extended Goodwin-Smith model (3) with negative feedbacks from T to L and R

Goodwin-type genetic oscillators are widely used to model circadian clocks [18]. Smith [45] suggested to use the model (1) to describe the periodic oscillations of testosterone in male; in the Smith model R, L and T stand for the serum concentrations of the gonadotropin release hormone (GnRH), luteinizing hormone (LH) and testosterone (Te). The model (1), henceforth referred to as *Goodwin-Smith* model, is also applied for modeling self-regulated metabolic pathways [10].

In this paper, a modification of the Goodwin-Smith model with an *additional negative feedback* is examined, described by the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{R} &= -b_1 R + f_1(T), \\ \dot{L} &= g_1 R - b_2 L + f_2(T), \\ \dot{T} &= g_2 L - b_3 T. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Unlike the conventional Goodwin-Smith model (1), system (3) involves two nonlinearities $f_1(\cdot)$ and $f_2(\cdot)$, assumed to be positive and decreasing; in particular, they can stand for different Hill-type functions (2); and these functions describe two negative feedback loops from T to R and L, respectively (Fig. 2).

In [4] a special case of the model (3) was introduced to describe the oscillations in the level of cortisol hormone. In the model from [4] the feedback loops are described by the same nonlinearity $f_1(T) = f_2(T) = f(T)$, which is supposed to be the Hill function (2); in this paper both of these limitations are discarded (however, unlike [4], we do not consider the effects of transport delays). The existence of two negative feedback loops has been revealed also in the mechanism of testosterone regulation [3, 5, 38, 43, 53], namely, "gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRH) drives pituitary luteinizing hormone (LH) secretion; LH in turn stimulates testicular Te synthesis; and systemic Te concentrations feed back negatively on both GnRH and LH signaling" [53].

Although similar to the Goodwin-Smith model (1), the extended model (3) however does not have the *cyclic* structure [2, 25, 31, 50] and thus cannot be examined by mathematical tools developed for cyclic systems, such as the criterion for periodic solutions existence [23]. The existing works on multi-feedback models of hormonal regulation [4, 5, 20, 49] have been confined to numerical analysis or establishing "local" stability properties. In particular, the existence of oscillatory solutions is proved by using the Hopf bifurcation theorem [20, 49]. Unlike these works, we establish not only local, but also *global* properties of the proposed model (3) such as the existence of oscillatory solutions, provided that the (only) equilibrium of the system is unstable.

3 Equilibria and local stability properties

It is assumed henceforth that $b_1, b_2, b_3, g_1, g_2 > 0$ as in the Goodwin-Smith model (1). We also adopt the following assumption on the functions f_1 and f_2.

Assumption 1 *The functions $f_1 : [0; \infty) \to (0; \infty)$ and $f_2 : [0; \infty) \to [0; \infty)$ are C^1-smooth and non-increasing, i.e. $f_1'(T), f_2'(T) \le 0$ for any $T \ge 0$.*

Notice that we allow that $f_2(T) \equiv 0$; all of the results, obtained below, are thus applicable to the classical Goodwin-Smith model (1). More generally, f_2 can be a non-negative constant. However, we are mainly interested in the case where f_2 is strictly decreasing, i.e. the system has an additional negative feedback loop.

Since R, L, T stand for the chemical concentrations, one is interested in the solutions, starting in the positive octant $R(0), L(0), T(0) \ge 0$; this requires, due to Assumption 1, that $R(t), L(t), T(t) > 0$ for any $t > 0$. Since $f_i(T) \le f_i(0)$, for all $T > 0$, every solution is bounded and prolongable up to ∞.

In order to find the system's equilibria, note that a point (R^0, L^0, T^0) is an equilibrium if and only if

$$R^0 = \frac{1}{b_1} f_1(T^0), \quad L^0 = \frac{b_3}{g_2} T^0 \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{b_1 b_2 b_3}{g_1 g_2} T^0 - \left[f_1(T^0) + \frac{b_1}{g_1} f_2(T^0) \right] = 0. \tag{5}$$

Assumption 1 implies that the equation (5) has the only solution $T^0 > 0$ since its left-hand side is increasing, negative at $T^0 = 0$ and becomes positive as $T^0 \to \infty$. Therefore, the systems has the only equilibrium in the positive octant. Linearizing of system (3) at this equilibrium, one arrives at the linear system

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} \delta R \\ \delta L \\ \delta T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -b_1 & 0 & f_1'(T^0) \\ g_1 & -b_2 & f_2'(T^0) \\ 0 & g_2 & -b_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta R \\ \delta L \\ \delta T \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

Introducing the auxiliary constants a_i as follows

$$a_1 \triangleq b_1 + b_2 + b_3, a_2 \triangleq b_1 b_2 + b_1 b_3 + b_2 b_3, a_3 \triangleq b_1 b_2 b_3, \tag{7}$$

the characteristic polynomial of (6) is given by

$$P(\lambda) = \lambda^3 + a_1\lambda^2 + [a_2 - g_2 f_2'(T^0)]\lambda + \\ + a_3 - g_2\left[g_1 f_1'(T^0) + b_1 f_2'(T^0)\right]. \quad (8)$$

Since its coefficients are positive, this polynomial has a real negative root, and the two remaining roots are either complex-conjugated or real of the same sign. Applying the Routh-Hurwitz criterion, one can show that the equilibrium is stable if $\Theta_0 < 0$ and unstable when $\Theta_0 > 0$. Here the discriminant Θ_0 is defined as follows

$$\Theta_0 \triangleq a_3 - a_1 a_2 + g_2\left[(b_2 + b_3) f_2'(T^0) - g_1 f_1'(T^0)\right]. \quad (9)$$

In both cases of $\Theta_0 < 0$ and $\Theta_0 > 0$, the equilibrium is *hyperbolic*, that is, system (6) has no pure imaginary eigenvalues. If $\Theta_0 = 0$, then it has a pair of pure imaginary eigenvalues. The local properties of the equilibrium are summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 2 *System* (3) *has the only equilibrium* (R^0, L^0, T^0) *in the positive octant; here* $T^0 > 0$ *is the only positive solution of* (5) *and* R^0, L^0 *are computed from* (4). *In both cases the equilibrium is* hyperbolic. *If* $\Theta_0 = 0$, *then the two eigenvalues are complex-conjugated imaginary numbers.*

Although local stability of the equilibrium does not imply the absence of periodic solutions (see Remark 7 below), systems with stable equilibria are often considered as biologically "infeasible", since the solutions starting close to the equilibrium exhibit the decay of oscillations, which is usually interpreted as death of the living system.

It is well known that the Goodwin-Smith model (1) can have unstable equilibrium only for some nonlinearities $f(T)$. Soon after the publication of the seminal Goodwin's paper [19], it was noticed [21] (see also [37, 45]) that for the Hill nonlinearity (2) the equilibrium can be unstable (for some choice of the parameters b_i, g_i) if and only if $n > 8$ (the extension of this result to cyclic systems of the dimension higher than 3 is referred to as the *secant criterion* [50]). If $n > 8$, then system (1) with the Hill feedback function (2) for some parameters b_i, g_i has unstable equilibrium and a periodic solution [45]; typically systems with such properties are considered as "true oscillators" in biological literature [37].

The following theorem, extending the mentioned result from [45] to the generalized system (3), is our first main result. To formulate it, we introduce a function

$$M(T) \triangleq -T f_1'(T)/f_1(T) > 0, \qquad \forall T > 0. \quad (10)$$

Theorem 3 *Let the functions* f_1, f_2 *satisfy Assumption 1. Then the following statements hold*

(1) if $M(T) < 8\ \forall T > 0$ *then* $\Theta_0 < 0$ *for any choice of* $b_i, g_i > 0$*: the equilibrium of* (3) *is stable;*
(2) if $M(T) \le 8\ \forall T > 0$ *then* $\Theta_0 \le 0$ *for any* $b_i, g_i > 0$*; the inequality is strict if* $f_2(T) > 0$ *for any* $T > 0$*;*
(3) if $M(T) > 8$ *for some* $T > 0$ *then there exist parameters* b_i, g_i *such that the equilibrium is unstable (*$\Theta_0 > 0$*) and the system has at least one non-constant periodic solution.*

Theorem 3 will be proved in Section 5. For the usual Goodwin-Smith model (1) it has been established in [45]. The existence of periodic solutions in statement 3 is based on the Hopf bifurcation theorem [40]. However, the proof substantially differs from most of the existing results on the Hopf bifurcation analysis in biological oscillators [20,27,47], which deal with delayed systems and study the Hopf bifurcations at the "critical" delay values, under which the equilibrium looses its stability. To construct a one-parameter family of systems (3), satisfying the conditions of the Hopf bifurcation theorem, is not a trivial task (unlike the delayed case, where the delay is a natural parameter). One of such parameterizations has been proposed in [45] for the case of $f_2 \equiv 0$; however, the paper [45] contains no complete and rigorous proof of the Hopf bifurcation even in the classical model (1); the existence of periodic solutions has been proved in [45] by using a general criterion from [23], which cannot be applied to the non-cyclic system (3).

Corollary 4 *Suppose that* $f_1(T)$ *is the Hill function* (2) *and* f_2 *satisfies Assumption 1. Then the equilibrium of* (3) *is stable whenever* $n \le 8$. *If* $n > 8$, *then for some choice of* $b_i, g_i > 0$ *the system has the unstable equilibrium and at least one periodic solution.*

The proof of Corollary 4 is straightforward since the function $M(T)$, associated with the Hill function (2), is

$$M(T) = -\frac{T f_1'(T)}{f_1(T)} = n\frac{\beta T^n}{1 + \beta T^n}.$$

Remark 5 *While the necessary condition for instability is independent of the function* $f_2(\cdot)$, *the set of parameters* b_i, g_i, *for which the equilibrium is unstable, depends on it.*

Remark 6 *Theorem 3 does not imply that a periodic solution exists,* whenever *the equilibrium in unstable. The corresponding strong result holds for the Goodwin-Smith model* (1) *and more general cyclic systems [23, 25], yet remains a non-trivial open problem for system* (3). *At the same time, system* (3) *with an unstable equilibrium oscillates in a weaker sense, as discussed in Section 4.*

Remark 7 *As was already mentioned, periodic solutions can exist even if the equilibrium is stable. In fact, in the case where* $M(T) > 8$ *it is possible to find such parameters* b_i, g_i *for which the equilibrium is locally stable yet the system has a closed orbit. The absence*

of (non-constant) periodic solutions in the case where $M(T) < 8$ seems to be an open problem even for the Goodwin-Smith system (1)*. Obviously, such solutions do not exist if the equilibrium is globally attractive in the positive octant; some sufficient conditions for the global stability of cyclic systems have been obtained in [2, 14].*

It should be noticed that although the Hill functions (2) with exponents $n > 4$ are often considered to be non-realistic [37], the Goodwin-Smith models with $n > 8$ adequately describe some metabolic reactions (see [17] and references therein). More important, the Goodwin-type oscillators with large Hill exponents n naturally arise from *model reduction* procedures [17], approximating a long chain of reaction by a three-dimensional system.

4 Oscillatory properties of the solutions

As one can notice, Theorem 3 does not establish any properties of system (3) with some specific parameters b_i, g_i. As discussed in Remark 6, it does not answer a natural question whether the equilibrium's instability $\Theta_0 > 0$ implies any oscillatory properties of the system. In the case of the classical Goodwin-Smith system (1) ($f_2 \equiv 0$) it is widely known that the local instability implies the existence of at least one periodic trajectory. A general result from [23] establishes this for a general *cyclic* system (with a sufficiently smooth right-hand side). The cyclic structure of the system and the equilibrium's instability imply the existence of an *invariant toroidal domain* [23], and closed orbits in it correspond to fixed points of the Poincaré map. This result, however, is not applicable to system (3). Another approach, used in [25, 26, 31] to examine oscillations in gene-protein regulatory circuits, employs elegant results by Mallet-Parret [32, 34], extending the Poincaré-Bendixsson theory to Goodwin-type systems. As discussed in Subsect. 4.2, these results can be applied to system (3) only if some additional restriction holds.

At the same time, when $\Theta_0 > 0$, one is able to prove an oscillatory property of the solutions, which was introduced by V.A. Yakubovich [51, 54] and states that the solution is bounded, yet does not converge to an equilibrium. In the next subsection it is shown that, in fact, almost all solutions are oscillatory in this sense.

4.1 Yakubovich-oscillatory solutions

Following [39], we introduce the following definition.

Definition 8 *A scalar bounded function $\varrho : [0; \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is Yakubovich-oscillatory as $t \to \infty$, or Y-*oscillation*, if $\underline{\lim}_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) < \overline{\lim}_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t)$. A vector-valued function $x : [0; \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is called Y-oscillation if at least one of its components is Y-oscillation. In other words, Y-oscillation is a bounded function, having no limit as $t \to \infty$.*

Our next main result shows that system (3) with an unstable equilibrium has Y-oscillations; moreover, almost every solution is Y-oscillation.

Theorem 9 *Suppose that system* (3) *has an unstable equilibrium ($\Theta_0 > 0$). Then for any initial condition $(R(0), L(0), T(0))$, except for the points from some negligible*[1] *set, the corresponding solution $(R(t), L(t), T(t))$ is Yakubovich-oscillatory as $t \to \infty$.*

Obviously, any periodic solution is Yakubovich-oscillatory, and the same holds for solutions converging to periodic orbits. In general, a dynamical system can have other Y-oscillations, e.g. showing "strange" (chaotic) behavior. It is known, however, that solutions of the conventional Goodwin-Smith model (1) and many other cyclic feedback systems [25, 26, 31] in fact exhibit a very regular behavior, similar to that of planar (two-dimensional) systems. The corresponding elegant result has been established in the papers by Mallet-Parret [32, 34]. A natural question, addressed in the next subsection, is the applicability of the Mallet-Parret to the extended Goodwin-Smith model (3).

4.2 The Mallet-Parret theorem for the extended Goodwin-Smith system: the structure of ω-limit set

A point x_* is said to be a *limit point* (or a partial limit) of a function $x : [t_0; \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^m$ (where $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$) at ∞ if there exists a sequence $t_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \infty$ such that $x(t_n) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} x_*$. The set of all limit points at ∞ is referred to as the ω-limit set of the function $x(\cdot)$ and denoted by $\omega(x)$. In general, the ω-limit set can be empty; however, for a *bounded* function it is always a non-empty compact connected set [9]. Similarly, for a function $x : (-\infty; t_0] \to \mathbb{R}^m$ one can define the limit points at $-\infty$; the set constituted by these points is called the α-limit set of the function and denoted by $\alpha(x)$. Obviously, the α-limit set of a function $x(t)$ coincides with the ω-limit of the function $\bar{x}(t) = x(-t)$.

The widely-known Poincaré-Bendixson theory for planar autonomous (time-invariant) systems states that the ω-limit set of a bounded solution can be a closed orbit, an equilibrium point or union of several equilibria and heteroclinic[2] trajectories, converging to them (it is possible that $\omega(x)$ is a union of an equilibrium and homoclinic trajectory, converging to it). Although this result is not applicable to the system of order 3 or higher, it remains valid for *cyclic* systems [34], including the classical Goodwin (1) and similar genetic oscilla-

[1] A subset of Euclidean space is *negligible* if its Lebesgue measure is equal to 0.

[2] Given a dynamical system $\dot{x} = f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, its *heteroclinic* solution is a globally defined non-constant solution $x(t) : (-\infty; \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^m$, whose limits at ∞ and $-\infty$ are equilibria. If these limits coincide, the solution is called *homoclinic*.

tors [25,26,31]. In the more recent papers [13,32,33] the Poincaré-Bendixson theory has been extended to tridiagonal systems (the result from [32] is applicable to even more general case of the delayed tridiagonal system). For the reader's convenience, we formulate the corresponding result below.

Consider the dynamical system of order $N+1$, where $N \geq 2$, described by the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_0 &= h_0(x_0, x_1) \\ \dot{x}_i &= h_i(x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, N-1 \\ \dot{x}_N &= h_N(x_{N-1}, x_N, x_0), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Here the functions $h_0(\xi, \zeta)$ and $h_i(\eta, \xi, \zeta)$, $(i = 1, \ldots, N)$, are C^1-smooth. It is assumed that all of them are *strictly* monotone in ζ; the functions $h_i(\eta, \xi, \zeta)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are also non-strictly monotone in η. That is, the ith chemical (where $i = 1, \ldots, N$) influences the production rate of the $(i-1)$th one, positively or negatively, and the 0th chemical influences the production of the Nth one. At the same time, chemical i (where $i = 0, \ldots, N-1$) may influence the production of chemical $(i+1)$; however, such an influence is not necessary: it is allowed that $\frac{\partial h_{i+1}}{\partial x_i} \equiv 0$. An important assumption is that the mutual influences of two "adjacent" components i and $i+1$ (where $i = 0, \ldots, N-1$) should be *equally signed*, i.e.,

$$\frac{\partial h_{i+1}}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial x_{i+1}} \geq 0 \quad \forall i = 0, \ldots, N-1. \tag{12}$$

Applying a simple change of variables, one may assume, without loss of generality [32,33] that

$$\frac{\partial h_i(\eta, \xi, \zeta)}{\partial \eta} \geq 0,\ \delta_i \frac{\partial h_i(\eta, \xi, \zeta)}{\partial \zeta} > 0,\ \delta_i = \begin{cases} 1, i < N \\ \pm 1, i = N. \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

In this paper, we are interested in tridiagonal systems (11) with a single equilibrium, for which the result of [32, Theorem 2.1] can be formulated [3] in the following simpler way [26, Lemma 1].

Lemma 10 *Suppose that the C^1-smooth nonlinearities h_i in* (11) *satisfy the conditions* (12) *and the system has only one equilibrium. Then the ω-limit set of any* bounded *solution can have one of the following structural types: (a) closed orbit; (b) union of the equilibrium point and a homoclinic trajectory; (c) the equilibrium point (singleton).*

[3] Formally, the paper [32] deals with delay systems, explicitly assuming that the delay is non-zero. The results are, however, valid for tridiagonal systems (11) without delays; as mentioned in [32, p. 2], the corresponding result (under some additional restrictions) has been established in [13].

It should be noticed that Lemma 10 cannot be directly applied to system (3) since the basic assumption (12) is violated: L positively influences T, being negatively influenced by it (Fig. 2). It appears, however, that under an additional assumption, a transformation of variables $(R, L, T) \to (x_0, x_1, x_2)$ exists, which guarantees not only the conditions (12), but even (13) with $\delta_N = -1$. The corresponding extension is our third main result.

Theorem 11 *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and*

$$\sup_{T \geq 0} |f_2'(T)| \leq \frac{(b_3 - b_2)^2}{4 g_2}. \tag{14}$$

Then any solution of (3) *has the ω-limit set of one of the three types, listed in Lemma 10. If the equilibrium is unstable, then almost any solution converges to either a periodic orbit or the closure of a homoclinic trajectory.*

It should be noticed that a homoclinic trajectory typically arises as a "limit" of stable limit cycles, whose periods tend to infinity (this phenomenon is known as the "homoclinic bifurcation" [1]). It can be thus considered as a "degenerate" limit cycle. As mentioned in [26], "the possibility of homoclinic orbits is negligibly small"; they are usually not observed in numerical simulations. It should be noticed that (14) automatically holds for the classical Goodwin-Smith oscillator.

5 Proofs of Theorems 3, 9 and 11

We start with the proof of Theorem 3, extending the proofs from [45] and [21]. The proof employs the widely known McLaurin's inequality for the case of three variables

$$\frac{1}{3}(b_1 + b_2 + b_3) \geq \left(\frac{1}{3} (b_1 b_2 + b_1 b_3 + b_2 b_3) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq (b_1 b_2 b_3)^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

which holds for any $b_1, b_2, b_3 > 0$; both inequalities are strict unless $b_1 = b_2 = b_3$. It implies, in particular, that

$$\frac{(b_1 + b_2 + b_3)(b_1 b_2 + b_1 b_3 + b_2 b_3)}{b_1 b_2 b_3} \geq 9. \tag{15}$$

Another result, used in the proof, is the Hopf bifurcation theorem [40]. This theorem deals with a one-parameter family of dynamical systems

$$\dot{x} = F(x, \mu), \quad \mu \in (-\varepsilon; \varepsilon). \tag{16}$$

It is assumed that for $\mu = 0$, the system has an equilibrium at x_0, for which $F(x, \mu)$ is C^1-smooth in the vicinity of $(x_0, 0)$, and the Jacobian matrix $D_x F(x_0, 0)$ has a pair of simple imaginary eigenvalues $\pm i\omega_0$ (where

$\omega_0 \neq 0$) and all other eigenvalues have non-zero real parts; in particular, $D_xF(x_0, 0)$ is invertible. The implicit function theorem implies that for $\mu \approx 0$ there exists an equilibrium point $x(\mu)$ of system (16) (that is, $F(x(\mu), \mu)$), such that $x(0) = x_0$. The corresponding Jacobian $D_xF(x(\mu), \mu)$ has a pair of complex-conjugated eigenvalues $\alpha(\mu) \pm \imath\omega(\mu)$, smooth for $\mu \approx 0$; here $\alpha(0) = 0$ and $\omega(0) = \omega_0$. The Hopf bifurcation theorem is as follows [40, Theorem 2.3].

Theorem 12 *If $\alpha'(0) \neq 0$, the dynamical system* (16) *undergoes the Hopf bifurcation at $\mu = 0$, that is, there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\mu \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0) \setminus \{0\}$ system* (16) *has a non-trivial periodic solution.*

Proof of Theorem 3.

Assuming that (R^0, L^0, T^0) is an equilibrium of (3) for some choice $b_i, g_i > 0$ and applying (5), one obtains

$$g_2 = \frac{b_1 b_2 b_3 T^0}{g_1 f_1(T^0) + b_1 f_2(T^0)}. \tag{17}$$

Substituting (17) into (9) and dividing by $(b_1 b_2 b_3)$, the inequality (15) and Assumption 1 imply the following

$$\frac{\Theta_0}{b_1 b_2 b_3} = \underbrace{\frac{T^0(b_2 + b_3) f_2'(T^0)}{g_1 f_1(T^0) + b_1 f_2(T^0)}}_{\leq 0} + \underbrace{\frac{g_1(-T^0 f_1'(T^0))}{g_1 f_1(T^0) + b_1 f_2(T^0)}}_{\leq M(T^0)}$$
$$- \frac{(b_1 + b_2 + b_3)(b_1 b_2 + b_1 b_3 + b_2 b_3)}{b_1 b_2 b_3} + 1 \leq M(T^0) - 8. \tag{18}$$

The inequality (18) is strict unless $b_1 = b_2 = b_3$ and $f_2(T^0) = f_2'(T^0) = 0$, implying thus statements 1 and 2.

We are now going to prove statement 3. Supposing that $M(T^0) > 8$ for some $T^0 > 0$, let L^0, R^0 be determined by (4)). It can be easily noticed from (5) that any system (3), whose parameters satisfy the condition (17), has the equilibrium at (R^0, L^0, T^0). We are now going to design a one-parameter family of the systems (3) with this equilibrium, switching from stability to instability through a Hopf bifurcation. To do this, we fix $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b$ (where $b > 0$ is chosen arbitrarily) and determine g_2 from (17), leaving the parameter $g_1 > 0$ free. It can be easily noticed from (18) that $\Theta_0 = \Theta_0(g_1)$ is a smooth and strict increasing function of g_1, $\lim\limits_{g_1 \to 0} \Theta_0(g_1) < 0$ and $\lim\limits_{g_1 \to \infty} \Theta_0(g_1) = M(T^0) - 8 > 0$. Thus for sufficiently large $g_1 > 0$ the system has unstable equilibrium point. Furthermore, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small the image of $\Theta_0(\cdot)$ contains the interval $(-\varepsilon; \varepsilon)$; therefore, one can define the smooth inverse function $g_1 = g_1(\mu)$ in such a way that $\Theta_0(g_1(\mu)) = \mu$ for any $\mu = (-\varepsilon; \varepsilon)$.

We now claim that the one-parameter family of systems (3) with $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b > 0$, $g_1 = g_1(\mu)$ and $g_2 = g_2(\mu)$ determined by (17) satisfies the conditions of Hopf bifurcation theorem (Theorem 12). By definition, the Routh-Hurwitz discriminant (9), corresponding to a specific μ, equals $\Theta_0(g_1(\mu)) = \mu$; by Lemma 2 the system with $\mu = 0$ has a pair of pure imaginary eigenvalues. Considering the extension of these eigenvalues $\alpha(\mu) \pm \imath\omega(\mu)$ for $\mu \approx 0$, it can be shown (see Appendix) that

$$2\alpha(\mu) \left[(a_1 + 2\alpha(\mu))^2 + (a_2 - g_2(\mu) f_2'(T^0)) \right] = \mu \tag{19}$$

(here a_1, a_2, a_3 are defined by (7)). Differentiating (19) at $\mu = 0$ and recalling that $\alpha(0) = 0$, one arrives at

$$\alpha'(0) = \frac{1}{2\left[a_1^2 + (a_2 - g_2(0) f_2'(T^0)\right]} > 0. \tag{20}$$

Therefore, for $\mu \in (0; \varepsilon_0)$ (where $\varepsilon_0 > 0$) system (3) with the aforementioned type has an unstable equilibrium at (R^0, L^0, T^0) and at least one periodic solution. Notice however that for $\mu \in (-\varepsilon_0; 0)$ the system also has a periodic solution in spite of the equilibrium's local stability, as discussed in Remark 7. □

Proof of Theorem 9

Theorem 9 is immediate from [39, Theorem 1] since system (3) (a) has the only equilibrium; (b) if $\Theta_0 > 0$ then this equilibrium is *hyperbolic* (there are no imaginary eigenvalues); (c) all solutions are uniformly ultimately bounded, that is, $C > 0$ exists such that

$$\overline{\lim_{t \to \infty}} \left(|R(t)| + |L(t)| + |T(t)| \right) \leq C \; \forall R(0), L(0), T(0) > 0.$$

The properties (a) and (b) follow from Lemma 2; to prove (c) it suffices to notice that (3) is decomposable as

$$\dot{X}(t) = AX(t) + F(X(t)), \; X(t) = (R(t), L(t), T(t))^\top,$$

where A is a Hurwitz matrix and $F(\cdot)$ is bounded. □

Proof of Theorem 11

The restriction (14) entails the existence of a one-to-one linear change of variables $(R, L, T) \mapsto (x_0, x_1, x_2)$, transforming (3) into the general system (11), satisfying (13) with $\delta_N = -1$, $N = 2$. Indeed, let $x_0 \triangleq T$, $x_1 \triangleq L + aT$ and $x_2 \triangleq R$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is a parameter to be specified later. The equations (3) shape into (11), where

$$\begin{aligned}
h_0(x_0, x_1) &\triangleq g_2(x_1 - a x_0) - b_3 x_0 \\
h_1(x_0, x_1, x_2) &\triangleq \left(a(b_2 - b_3) - g_2 a^2 \right) x_0 + a g_2 x_1 + \\
&\quad + g_1 x_2 + f_2(x_0) \\
h_2(x_1, x_2, x_0) &\triangleq -b_1 x_2 + f_1(x_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $g_1, g_2 > 0$, the conditions (13) hold provided that

$$\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_0} \geq a(b_2 - b_3) - g_2 a^2 - \sup |f_2'(T)| \geq 0,$$

which always can be provided under the assumption (14) by choosing appropriate $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Theorem 11 now follows from Lemma 10 and Theorem 9 (if the equilibrium is unstable, then almost all solutions do not converge to the equilibrium). □

6 Numerical simulation

In this section, we give a numerical simulation, which allows to compare the behaviors of systems (1) and (3). The model parameters $b_1 = 0.1$ min^{-1}, $b_2 = 0.015$ min^{-1}, $b_3 = 0.023$ min^{-1}, $g_1 = 5$ min^{-1} and $g_2 = 0.01$ min^{-1} are chosen to comply with the existing experimental data reported in [6, 12]. The negative feedbacks from T to R and L are chosen to be Hill-type nonlinearities

$$f_1(T) = \frac{K_1}{1 + \beta_1 T^n}, \quad f_2(T) = \frac{K_2}{1 + \beta_2 T^m},$$

respectively, which satisfy Assumption 1. Parameters of f_1 are considered to be $K_1 = \beta_1 = n = 20$ [12]. To show clearly the effect of the additional feedback f_2 on the dynamics of system (3), its parameters are chosen to be $K_2 = m = 20$ and $\beta_2 = 10$. By solving the nonlinear equation (5) and substituting its solution into (4), the equilibria of systems (1) and (3) are given by $E_{GS} = (0.0098,\ 3.2529,\ 1.4143)$ and $E_{New} = (0.0094,\ 3.2589,\ 1.4169)$, respectively. Moreover, the quantity Θ_0, defined in (9), for systems (1) and (3) are given by $\Theta_0^{GS} = 1.5207 \times 10^{-4}$ and $\Theta_0^{New} = 1.1590 \times 10^{-4}$, confirming the instability of equilibria. It should be noticed that for calculating E_{GS} and Θ_0^{GS}, we set $f_2 \equiv 0$ in (4),(5) and (9). Both systems (1) and (3) are plotted in Fig. 3 for a time period of 24 hours with the same parameters and initial conditions $(R(0), L(0), T(0)) = (1\ pg/ml,\ 6\ ng/ml,\ 2\ ng/ml)$. Although nonlinearity f_2 considered in the example does not satisfy condition (14), system (3) still have oscillatory behavior for parameters b_i and g_i considered above.

It is reported that exerting the feedback from Te to LH results in LH's amplitude reduction [28, p.26]. As it is seen in Fig. 3, after some time, both amplitude and period of the oscillations of R, L and T in system (3) become less than the corresponding ones in system (1). The amplitudes of oscillation for systems (1) and (3), calculated numerically, are given by

$$A_{GS} \approx (52\ pg/ml,\ 3.64\ ng/ml,\ 0.58\ ng/ml),$$

and

$$A_{New} \approx (41.75\ pg/ml,\ 3.04\ ng/ml,\ 0.46\ ng/ml),$$



Fig. 3. Red and blue plots show numerical simulations of systems (1) and (3), respectively, with the same initial conditions and parameter values.

respectively. Furthermore, the periods of oscillation for systems (1) and (3) are given by $P_{GS} \approx 1.870$ and $P_{New} \approx 1.755$. So the feedback $f_2(\cdot)$ influences both the amplitude and period of oscillations.

7 Conclusions and future works

A new mathematical model for hormonal regulation has been proposed, which extends the conventional Goodwin-Smith model by taking the additional negative feedback into account. We have examined both "local" properties of the new model (such as its possibility to have unstable equilibrium for some choice of the parameters and the existence of the Hopf bifurcations) and its "global" properties, such as the existence of periodic and other "oscillatory" solutions. Further extensions of the proposed model, including transport delays and pulsatile feedback are the subject of ongoing research.

References

[1] V.S. Afraimovich, S.V. Gonchenko, L.M. Lerman, A.L. Shilnikov, and D.V. Turaev. Scientific heritage of L.P. Shilnikov. *Regular and Chaotic Dynam.*, 19(4):435–460, 2014.

[2] M. Arcak and E.D. Sontag. Diagonal stability of a class of cyclic systems and its connection with the secant criterion. *Automatica*, 42:1531–1537, 2006.

[3] C.J. Bagatell, K.D. Dahl, and W.J. Bremner. The direct pituitary effect of testosterone to inhibit gonadotropin secretion in men is partially mediated by aromatization to estradiol. *J. Andrology*, 15(1):15–21, 1994.

[4] N Bairagi, Samrat Chatterjee, and J Chattopadhyay. Variability in the secretion of corticotropin-releasing hormone, adrenocorticotropic hormone and cortisol and understandability of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis dynamicsa mathematical study based on clinical evidence. *Mathematical Medicine and Biology*, 25:37–63, 2008.

[5] L. Bing-Zheng and D. Gou-Min. An improved mathematical model of hormone secretion in the hypothalamo-pituitary-gonadal axis in man. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 150(1):51–58, 1991.

[6] M. Cartwright and M. Husain. A model for the control of testosterone secretion. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 123(2):239–250, 1986.

[7] A. Churilov, A. Medvedev, and P. Mattsson. Periodical solutions in a pulse-modulated model of endocrine regulation with time-delay. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 59(3):728–733, 2014.

[8] A. Churilov, A. Medvedev, and A. Shepeljavyi. Mathematical model of non-basal testosterone regulation in the male by pulse modulated feedback. *Automatica*, 45(1):78–85, 2009.

[9] E.A. Coddington and N. Levinson. *Theory of ordinary differential equations*. Tata McGraw-Hill Education, 1955.

[10] R. Costalat and J. Burger. Effect of enzyme organization on the stability of Yates-Pardee pathways. *Bull. of Math. Biol.*, 58(4):719–737, 1996.

[11] J. Cronin. The Danziger-Elmergreen theory of periodic catatonic schizophrenia. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 35:689–707, 1973.

[12] Pritha Das, AB Roy, and A Das. Stability and oscillations of a negative feedback delay model for the control of testosterone secretion. *Biosystems*, 32(1):61–69, 1994.

[13] A.S. Elkhader. A result on a feedback system of ordinary differential equations. *J. Dynam. Diff. Equations*, 4(3):399–418, 1992.

[14] G.A. Enciso, H.L. Smith, and E.D. Sontag. Nonmonotone systems decomposable into monotone systems with negative feedback. *J. Diff. Equations*, 224:205–227, 2006.

[15] German Enciso and Eduardo D Sontag. On the stability of a model of testosterone dynamics. *J. Math. Biol.*, 49(6):627–634, 2004.

[16] P.G. Ghomsi, F.M.M. Kakmeni, T.C. Kofane, and C. Tchawoua. Synchronization dynamics of chemically coupled cells with activator-inhibitor pathways. *Phys. Lett. A*, 378:2813–2823, 2014.

[17] D. Gonze and W. Abou-Jaoude. The Goodwin model: Behind the Hill function. *PLoS One*, 8(8):e69573, 2013.

[18] D. Gonze, S. Bernard, C. Waltermann, A. Kramer, and H. Herzel. Spontaneous synchronization of coupled circadian oscillators. *Biophys. J.*, 89:120–129, 2005.

[19] B.C. Goodwin. Oscillatory behaviour in enzymatic control processes. *Adv. in Enzyme Regulation*, 3:425–438, 1965.

[20] D. Greenhalgh and Q.J.A. Khan. A delay differential equation mathematical model for the control of the hormonal system of the hypothalamus, the pituitary and the testis in man. *Nonlinear Analysis*, 71:e925–e935, 2009.

[21] J.S. Griffith. Mathematics of cellular control processes. negative feedback to one gene. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 20:202–208, 1968.

[22] John E Hall and Arthur C Guyton. *Textbook of medical physiology*. Elsevier Inc., 2006.

[23] S. Hastings, J. Tyson, and D. Webster. Existence of periodic solutions for negative feedback cellular control systems. *J. Differential Equations*, 25:39–64, 1977.

[24] JW Honour. Hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis. *Respiratory Medicine*, 88:9–15, 1994.

[25] Y. Hori, T.-H. Kim, and S. Hara. Existence criteria of periodic oscillations in cyclic gene regulatory networks. *Automatica*, 47:1203–1209, 2011.

[26] Y. Hori, M. Takada, and S. Hara. Biochemical oscillations in delayed negative cyclic feedback: Existence and profiles. *Automatica*, 49(9):2581–2590, 2013.

[27] Ch. Huang and J. Cao. Hopf bifurcation in an n-dimensional Goodwin model via multiple delays feedback. *Nonlinear Dynamics*, 79:2541–2552, 2015.

[28] F.R. Kandeel. *Male Reproductive Dysfunction: Pathophysiology and Treatment*. CRC Press, 2007.

[29] D M. Keenan and J. D. Veldhuis. A biomathematical model of time-delayed feedback in the human male hypothalamic-pituitary-leydig cell axis. *Amer. J. Physiol.– Endocrinology And Metabolism*, 275(1):E157–E176, 1998.

[30] D.M. Keenan, W. Sun, and J.D. Veldhuis. A stochastic biomathematical model of the male reproductive hormone system. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 61(3):934–965, 2000.

[31] T.-H. Kim, Y. Hori, and S. Hara. Robust stability analysis of gene-protein regulatory networks with cyclic activation repression interconnections. *Syst. Control Lett.*, 60(6):373–382, 2011.

[32] J. Mallet-Paret and G.R. Sell. The Poincaré–Bendixson theorem for monotone cyclic feedback systems with delay. *J. Diff. Equations*, 125(2):441–489, 1996.

[33] J. Mallet-Paret and G.R. Sell. Systems of differential delay equations: Floquet multipliers and discrete lyapunov functions. *J. Diff. Equations*, 125(2):385–440, 1996.

[34] J. Mallet-Paret and H.L. Smith. The Poincaré-Bendixson theorem for monotone cyclic feedback systems. *J. Dynam. Diff. Equations*, 2(4):367–421, 1990.

[35] A.I. Mees and P. E. Rapp. Periodic metabolic systems: Oscillations in multiple-loop negative feedback biochemical control networks. *J. Math. Biol.*, 5:99–114, 1978.

[36] Thomas Mulligan, Ali Iranmanesh, Michael L Johnson, Martin Straume, and Johannes D Veldhuis. Aging alters feed-forward and feedback linkages between lh and testosterone in healthy men. *Amer. J. Physiol. - Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology*, 273(4):R1407–R1413, 1997.

[37] J.D. Murray. *Mathematical Biology I: An introduction*. 3rd ed. Springer, New York, 2002.

[38] Y. Nagayama. Direct feedback inhibition by endogenous testosterone on the pituitary in man. *J. Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, 45(2):215–220, 1977.

[39] A. Pogromsky, T. Glad, and H. Nijmeijer. On diffusion driven oscillations in coupled dynamical systems. *Int. J. Bifurcation and Chaos*, 9(04):629–644, 1999.

[40] A. B. Poore. On the theory and application of the Hopf-Friedrichs bifurcation theory. *Archive Rational Mech. Anal.*, 60(4):371–393, 1976.

[41] S. Roston. Mathematical representation of some endocrinological systems. *Bull. Math. Biophys.*, 21:271–282, 1959.

[42] S. Ruan and J. Wei. On the zeros of a third degree exponential polynomial with applications to a delayed model for the control of testosterone secretion. *IMA J. Math. Appl. Med. Biol.*, 18(1):41–52, 2001.

[43] C.B. Sheckter, A.M. Matsumoto, and W.J. Bremner. Testosterone administration inhibits gonadotropin secretion by an effect directly on the human pituitary*. *J. Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, 68(2):397–401, 1989.

[44] S. Sinha and R. Ramaswamy. On the dynamics of controlled metabolic network and cellular behavior. *BioSystems*, 20:341–354, 1987.

[45] W.R. Smith. Hypothalamic regulation of pituitary secretion of luteinizing hormoneii feedback control of gonadotropin secretion. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 42(1):57–78, 1980.

[46] W.R. Smith. Qualitative mathematical models of endocrine systems. *Amer. J. Physiol. - Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology*, 245(4):R473–R477, 1983.

[47] X. Sun, R. Yuan, and J. Cao. Bifurcations for Goodwin model with three delays. *Nonlin. Dynamics*, 84:1093–1105, 2016.

[48] H. Taghvafard, A.V. Proskurnikov, and M. Cao. Stability properties of the goodwin-smith oscillator model with additional feedback. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 49(14):131–136, 2016.

[49] T. Tanutpanit, P. Pongsumpun, and I. M. Tang. A model for the testosterone regulation taking into account the presence of two types of testosterone hormones. *J. Biol. Syst.*, 23(2):259–273, 2015.

[50] C.D. Thron. The secant condition for instability in biochemical feedback control - parts i and ii. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 53:383–424, 1991.

[51] E.A. Tomberg and V.A. Yakubovich. Conditions for auto-oscillations in nonlinear systems. *Int. J. Bifurcation and Chaos*, 30(4):641–653, 1989.

[52] J.D. Veldhuis. Recent insights into neuroendocrine mechanisms of aging of the human male hypothalamic-pituitary-gonadal axis. *J. Andrology*, 20(1):1–18, 1999.

[53] J.D. Veldhuis, D.M. Keenan, P.Y. Liu, A. Iranmanesh, P.Y. Takahashi, and A.X. Nehra. The aging male hypothalamic–pituitary–gonadal axis: Pulsatility and feedback. *Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology*, 299(1):14–22, 2009.

[54] V.A. Yakubovich. Frequency-domain criteria for oscillation in nonlinear systems with one stationary nonlinear component. *Siberian Math. J.*, 14(5):768–788, 1973.

The proof of equality (19)

In this technical Appendix, we prove the following auxiliary lemma, used in the proof of Theorem 3 (namely, in establishing (19)).

Lemma 13 *Suppose that the characteristic polynomial* (8) *has a pair of complex-conjugate zeros* $\alpha \pm \imath\beta$. *Introducing the discriminant* Θ_0 *by* (9)*, one has*

$$2\alpha\left[a_1+2\alpha\right]^2+2\alpha\left[a_2-g_2f_2'(T^0)\right]=\Theta_0. \qquad (.1)$$

The proof is based on Vieta's formulas

$$\begin{cases}\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3=-a_1,\\ \lambda_1\lambda_2+\lambda_2\lambda_3+\lambda_1\lambda_3=a_2-g_2f_2'(T^0),\\ \lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3=-a_3+g_2\left[g_1f_1'(T^0)+b_1f_2'(T^0)\right],\end{cases} \qquad (.2)$$

where $\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3$ are the zeros of $P(\lambda)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\lambda_1\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda_{2,3}=\alpha\pm\imath\beta$. The first equality in (.2) implies that $\lambda_1=-(a_1+2\alpha)$, and the second one entails that $\lambda_2\lambda_3=(a_2-g_2f_2'(T))+2\alpha(a_1+2\alpha)$. The equality (.1) is now straightforward

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_0&=a_3-g_2[b_1f_2'(T^0)+g_1f_1'(T^0)]-a_1\left[a_2-g_2f_2'(T^0)\right]\\&=-\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3+(\lambda_1+2\alpha)[a_2-g_2f_2'(T)]\\&=-\lambda_1[\lambda_2\lambda_3-(a_2-g_2f_2'(T))]+2\alpha(a_2-g_2f_2'(T))\\&=(a_1+2\alpha)[\lambda_2\lambda_3-(a_2-g_2f_2'(T))]+2\alpha(a_2-g_2f_2'(T))\\&=2\alpha[a_1+2\alpha]^2+2\alpha[a_2-g_2f_2'(T)].\qquad\square\end{aligned}$$